

**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)  
sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
teutafani@quinnemanuel.com  
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
Marie Hayrapetian (CA Bar No. 315797)  
mariehayrapetian@quinnemanuel.com  
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)  
tracygao@quinnemanuel.com  
Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com  
1300 I Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington D.C., 20005  
Telephone: (202) 538-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 538-8100

Jomaire Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
New York, NY 10010  
Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

*Counsel for Defendant Google LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,  
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER  
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,  
individually and on behalf of all similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**GOOGLE LLC'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO SEAL PORTIONS OF  
GOOGLE LLC'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO EXCLUDE OPINIONS OF  
PLAINTIFFS' DAMAGES EXPERT  
MICHAEL J. LASINSKI**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully seeks to seal the following portions of Google LLC’s Reply In Support of Motion to Exclude Opinions of Plaintiffs’ Damages Expert Michael J. Lasinski (“Reply”), which contain Google’s confidential and proprietary information, including details related to Google’s internal projects, as well as internal metrics, and their proprietary functionalities. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Reply:

Documents Sought to Be Sealed	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
Google LLC’s Reply In Support of Motion to Exclude Opinions of Plaintiffs’ Damages Expert Michael J. Lasinski	Portions Highlighted at:  Pages 4:8, 8:27, 9:20-21, 9:24, 10:5, 10:12-13, 10:15-16	Google
Exhibit 9 to Trebicka Declaration – 8/18/22 Strombom Depo Trans. Excerpts	Portions Highlighted at:  Page 113:21	Google

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

The common law right of public access to judicial records in a civil case is not a constitutional right and it is “not absolute.” *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (noting that the “right to inspect and copy judicial records is not absolute” and that “courts have refused to permit their files to serve as reservoirs of . . . sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing”). Sealing is appropriate when the information at issue constitutes “competitively sensitive information,” such as “confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *France Telecom S.A. v. Marvell Semiconductor Inc.*, 2014 WL 4965995, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2014); *see also Phillips v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1211 (9th Cir. 2002) (acknowledging courts’ “broad latitude” to “prevent disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, but not limited to, trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information”).

### 1 **III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

2 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business  
3 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 589-99; *see also*  
4 *Turner v. United States*, 2019 WL 4732143, at \*9 (finding good cause to seal “confidential medical  
5 information”). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that “contain[ ]  
6 confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public disclosure could  
7 harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg. of Texas, LLC v.*  
8 *Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that could harm a  
9 litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons” standard. *See e.g.*,  
10 *Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4,  
11 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’ standard where that  
12 information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation omitted).

13 Here, the Reply comprises confidential information regarding highly sensitive features of  
14 Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly. Specifically, this  
15 information provides details related to Google’s internal projects, as well as internal metrics, and their  
16 proprietary functionalities. Such information reveals Google’s internal strategies, system designs, and  
17 business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with  
18 legal and privacy obligations.

19 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it  
20 has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of  
21 Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, designs, and practices to Google’s competitors. That alone is  
22 a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-  
23 02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain  
24 sensitive business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and  
25 security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-  
26 02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because  
27 “disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”);  
28 *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at \*8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting

1 motion to seal as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publically  
2 available”).

3 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to  
4 compromise Google’s internal systems and data structures. Google would be placed at an increased  
5 risk of cybersecurity threats, and data related to its users could similarly be at risk. *See, e.g., In re*  
6 *Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material  
7 concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted”  
8 because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system”). The security  
9 threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

10 The information Google seeks to redact is the minimal amount of information needed to  
11 protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to  
12 nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The  
13 “good cause” rather than the “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either standard,  
14 Google’s sealing request is warranted.

#### 15 **IV. CONCLUSION**

16 For the foregoing reasons, Google respectfully requests that the Court seal the identified  
17 portions of the Reply.

18 DATED: August 26, 2022

19 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP

20 By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

21 Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com  
22 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
23 Telephone: (312) 705-7400  
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

24 Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)  
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com  
25 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)  
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com  
26 Crystal Nix-Hines (Bar No. 326971)  
crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com  
27 Marie Hayrapetian (CA Bar No. 315797)  
28

1 mariehayrapetian@quinnemanuel.com  
2 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor  
3 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
4 Telephone: (213) 443-3000  
5 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

6 Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)  
7 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com  
8 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor  
9 Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
10 Telephone: (650) 801-5000  
11 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

12 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
13 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com  
14 1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900  
15 Washington, D.C. 20005  
16 Telephone: 202-538-8000  
17 Facsimile: 202-538-8100

18 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
19 jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com  
20 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor  
21 New York, NY 10010  
22 Telephone: (212) 849-7000  
23 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

24 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)  
25 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com  
26 50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
27 San Francisco, CA 94111  
28 Telephone: (415) 875-6600  
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

*Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*